

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 14, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-17 were pending and rejected claims 1-17. Claims 1-13 and 15-17 have been amended, claim 14 has been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-13 and 15-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,759. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

The Applicant has amended the features of claim 14 into claim 1. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claim 1 now recites "-- input-output means for receiving a continuous stream of digital data; processing means for processing said digital data; and stream control means, wherein the processing means comprising: **direct memory access** transfer means for transferring said continuous stream of digital data between the input-output means and a storage area; and communication means for communicating with the stream control means security data obtained from said digital data , the stream control means being adapted to control the transfer of the continuous stream of

digital data by the **direct memory access** transfer means taking into account said security data.

The Office asserts that the features of claim 14 were disclosed over Lee in view of Pyle, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,231.

However, even if arguendo, it was acknowledged that Lee disclosed the features of claim 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would not arrive at the features of claims 1 and 14 combined.

As explained at the beginning of the instant specification, solutions using DMA transfer were considered incompatible with secure processing. In particular, ¶ 0010 of the printed publication version states

The invention aims, by overcoming this apparent incompatibility, to enable transfer of a voluminous or fast secure data stream in a microcircuit card whilst maintaining a high security level thanks to an original association of a processor and direct memory access.

Further, Pyle does not relate to a microcircuit card as the present invention but to a metering unit. Teachings in the field of metering units cannot simply be applied to the field of microcircuit cards because of the high level of security in the latter.

Further, even if arguendo, one of ordinary skill in the art would consider the teachings of Pyle to improve microcircuit cards, he or she would obviously introduce a DMA component in the microcircuit card to "automatically" transfer data, as admitted by the Office (see page 9, line 12 in the Office Action: "a DMA controller that automatically transfers network frame data

between the network controller and buffers in a host system memory").

However, Pyle does not disclose, teach or suggest "stream control means [...] to **control** the transfer of the continuous stream of digital data by the direct memory access transfer means," as in amended claim 1.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Office asserts that Lee, col. 3, lines 51-59; and col. 7, lines 17-23 disclose "**first input-output means for receiving digital data; processing means for processing said digital data; transfer means for transferring said digital data between the first input-output means and a storage area; second input-output means for receiving preliminary data; stream control means adapted to control the transfer of digital data by the transfer means taking into account said preliminary data,**" (emphasis added) as in claim 16.

However, the Applicant fail to see where Lee describes a **first** input-output means for receiving digital data and a **second** input-output means for receiving preliminary data meant to participate in controlling the transfer of digital data ("stream control means [are] adapted to control the transfer of digital data taking into account the preliminary data" according to the last feature of claim 16.

For the purposes of compact prosecution, in any future Office Action where the Office maintains the rejection of claim 16 over Lee, specifically point out and explain where stream

control means adapted to control the transfer of digital data by the transfer means taking into account said preliminary data is disclosed. The Applicants fail to see how col. 7, lines 17-34 applies against the present claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 16 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Lee. Further, Lee and Pyle, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Pyle, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,231. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Claim 14 has been amended into claim 1 and claim 14 cancelled. The argument above as to the combinability of the references applied likewise to the present rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-13 and 15-17 continue to be allowable. It is

further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb